

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH.**

Crl. Misc. No. 8402-M of 2007  
DATE OF DECISION : 13.03.2007

Amarjeet

.... PETITIONER

Versus

State of Haryana

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Mor, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Petitioner Amarjeet has filed this petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 45 dated 12.3.2005 under Sections 307/34 IPC and 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.

2. I have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of the FIR as well as the order dated 22.12.2006, passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat, whereby bail application of the petitioner has been dismissed.

3. In the aforesaid case, as per the prosecution version, two boys came to the shop of Ravi and one of them caused bullet injury on Ravi. Counsel for the petitioner contends that as per investigation, the petitioner was not among those two boys, but it was found that he was driving the car, in which the aforesaid two boys ran away. Counsel further contends that vide order dated July 13, 2006, passed by this court, bail was granted to the petitioner and since then, he was regularly appearing before the trial court. Subsequently, on November 25, 2006, when two prosecution witnesses were present in the trial court, the petitioner could not appear, due to which his bail bonds were cancelled and he was summoned through non-bailable

warrants. Counsel further contends that subsequently, the petitioner was arrested on 18.12.2006 and since then, he is in custody. He submits that non-appearance of the petitioner before the trial court on 25.11.2006 was not intentional, as he was ill. In this regard, a medical certificate has also been annexed with this petition. The aforesaid material facts have not been disputed by the State Counsel.

4. In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to grant regular bail to the petitioner and he is, accordingly, ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial court, subject to his furnishing heavy surety with an undertaking that in future, he will regularly appear before the trial court on each and every date of hearing.

**March 13, 2007**  
ndj

**( SATISH KUMAR MITTAL )**  
**JUDGE**